

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 23, 2008 the Office noted that claims 8-15 were pending and rejected claims 8-15. Claims 8, 10 and 15 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claims 16 and 17 have been added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 8-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sugikawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,949,772 in view of Amano, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0120647. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Sugikawa discusses that upon the withdrawal of a device from a network a new service providing device is selected among other devices.

Amano discusses the detection of errors in mark-up language data and the output of corrected data.

In contrast, the present invention embodied in the claims is directed to an error correction solution with a self learning capability. If a service request contains an error correction process is initiated. In such a process a memory containing only service request whose contents are corrected are

utilized. In the process the received service request with an error is at least partly substituted with contents of a service request (which most resembles the service request) stored in the memory.

To emphasize these features, the independent claims have been amended to recite "storing, in a memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct, said service request if the service request has led to successful identification of the requested service, initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified," as in claim 1. (Emphasis added) Support for the amendment may be found on page 2, lines 22-24 of the Specification. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the amendment of the claims.

It is asserted on page 4 of the Office Action that Sugikawa, col. 11, lines 25-37, discloses this feature. The Applicants acknowledge that Sugikawa discusses a "data recorded unit 404, comprised of a memory or a hard disk, records data about service request programs and providable services and information on the users or clients."

However, Sugikawa as cited does not discuss that the

memory only contains service requests whose contents are correct. Sugikawa as cited is silent as to the state of the service requests. Further, Sugikawa, col. 12, lines 56-61 implies the opposite, information about service requests with incorrect contents can be found in the memory.

On page 4 the Office Action it is acknowledged that Sugikawa, does not disclose "initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory *containing only service requests whose contents are correct*, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified, and repeating said analyzing at the access point and/or service source for the corrected service request, and providing an identified service to the source of the service request if a service can be identified," but is asserted that Amano does.

However, nothing in Amano states that the memory contains only a service request whose contents are correct.

Instead, Amano ¶ 0017 states the "correction code is calculated for a character that represents an attribute value or attribute name." If the character needs to be corrected then the memory contains contents that are incorrect.

Further, the Applicants disagree with the assertion of the Office that one would be motivated to supplement Sugikawa

with the teachings of Amano. Sugikawa discusses handling packets bound for a device where the packet cannot be delivered and must be delivered to another device providing the requested service.

Amona discusses error correction of XML application data. One of ordinary skill in the art of writing software for hardware devices would not look to application code to solve the deficiencies of Sugikawa. The programming requirements for system code are much more rigorous and thusly, application code would not suffice to solve such a deficiency.

The Applicant has likewise amended claims 10 and 15. For at least the reasons discussed above, Sugikawa and Amano, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 8, 10 and 15 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 16 and 17 are new. Support for claims 16 and 17 may be found, for example, on page 3, lines 15-32 of the Specification. The prior art of records fails to disclose the keyword is a user entered search term and the requested service is human perceivable data.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 8-15 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb